

PTO/SB/33 (01-09)

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

Approved for use through 02/28/2009. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trad emark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional)	
		SON-3162	
	Application Number Filed		Filed
	10/579,211-Conf. #6592		May 12, 2006
	First Named Inventor		
	Toshihiko Shirasagi		
	·		
	Art Unit		Examiner
	17	795	A. L. Verderame
Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.			
This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.			
*			
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.			
I am the			y ₀ 290
applicant /inventor.	_		Signature
assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)	_		nanen/Christopher M. Tobin ed or printed name
x attorney or agent of record.			
Registration number 24,104/40,290			
registration number		C	202) 955-3750
attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.			elephone number
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34.		June 18, 2009	
registration number it during affect of of (1.54.	Date		
NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.			
x *Total of 1 forms are submitted.			



Docket No.: SON-3162

(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of: Toshihiko Shirasagi, et al.

Application No.: 10/579,211

rippiication ivo.: 10/5/75,21

Filed: May 12, 2006

For: MANUFACTURING METHOD OF MASTER

DISC FOR OPTICAL DISC, AND MASTER

DISC FOR OPTICAL DISC

Confirmation No.: 6592

Art Unit: 1795

Examiner: A. L. Verderame

REQUEST FOR PRE-APPEAL BRIEF PANEL REVIEW OF REJECTION

MS AF Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Madam:

This is in full and timely response to the Office Action mailed on February 18, 2009.

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action indicates a rejection of claims 1, 4-7 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Japanese Application Publication No. 2003-315998 (Kouchiyama'988) or International Application Publication No. WO 2004/034391 (Kouchiyama'391) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,786,538 (Saito), U.S. Patent No. 4,916,048 (Yamada), and Japanese Application Publication No. 2001-344826 (Lee).

This rejection is traversed at least for the following reasons.

Kouchiyama'391 is in the national stage (35 U.S.C. 371) of an International Application filed on or after November 29, 2000 and which was *not published in English* under PCT Article 21(2).

As a rule, according to 35 U.S.C. 102 (e), <u>no benefit of the international filing date</u> (nor any U.S. filing dates prior to the IA) is given for 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) prior art purposes if the IA was published under PCT Article 21(2) in a language other than English, regardless of whether the international application entered the national stage. See M.P.E.P. §706.02(f)(1).

The above-identified application is entitled to benefit of the filing date for Japanese Patent Application No. 2003-401836 of <u>December 1, 2003</u>.

Kouchiyama'391 has a publication date of April 4, 2004.

In this regard, the filing date for Japanese Patent Application No. 2003-401836 of December 1, 2003 is *earlier* than the publication date of <u>April 4, 2004</u> for Kouchiyama'391.

Thus, the Kouchiyama'391 appears to be <u>unavailable as prior art</u> and that the rejections of the claims using this reference should be <u>withdrawn</u> as a result.

The Advisory Action dated April 7, 2009 has requested a certified English Translation of the priority document for the present application, Japanese Patent Application No. 2003-401836.

In response, a <u>certified English Translation</u> of Japanese Patent Application No. 2003-401836 has been <u>filed</u> on May 15, 2009.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

New grounds of rejection

Paragraph 2 of the non-final Office Action mailed on September 3, 2008 has *failed* to include a rejection of either original claim 3 or original claim 7.

The Amendment in Response to Non-Final Office Action filed on December 3, 2008 wholly incorporated the features of claim 3 into claim 1 to form amended claim 1.

No other amendment to claim 1 is found within the Amendment in Response to Non-Final Office Action.

As a result of this amendment, originally-filed claim 3 is now finally rejected claim 1.

Moreover, the Amendment in Response to Non-Final Office Action filed on December 3, 2008 wholly incorporated the features of claim 9 into claim 7 to form amended claim 7.

<u>No other amendment</u> to claim 7 is found within the Amendment in Response to Non-Final Office Action.

As a result of this amendment, originally-filed claim 9 is now finally rejected claim 7.

Nevertheless, paragraph 2 of the Office Action cites International Application Publication No. WO 2004/034391 (Kouchiyama'391) in the rejection of claims 1, 4-7, and 10. Claim 1 is originally-filed claim 3 and claim 7 is originally-filed claim 9.

Thus, the new rejection of claims 1 and 7 made within the Final Office Action is a new ground of rejection that was <u>neither necessitated by applicant's amendment</u> of claim 1 within the Amendment in Response to Non-Final Office Action filed on September 3, 2008 <u>nor based on information submitted in an information disclosure statement</u>.

Accordingly, the finality of the rejection of claims 1 and 7 made within the Final Office Action is *premature* at least for this reason.

Official Notice

There is no concession as to the veracity of Official Notice, if taken in any Office Action.

An affidavit or document should be provided in support of any Official Notice taken. 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2), MPEP § 2144.03. See also, *Ex parte Natale*, 11 USPQ2d 1222, 1227-1228 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1989)(failure to provide any objective evidence to support the challenged use of Official Notice constitutes clear and reversible error).

Extensions of time

Please treat any concurrent or future reply, requiring a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge all required fees, fees under 37 C.F.R. §1.17, or all required extension of time fees.

Fees-general authorization

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees filed, asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm).

If any fee is required or any overpayment made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee or credit the overpayment to Deposit Account # 18-0013.

Conclusion

This response is believed to be a complete response to the Office Action.

Applicants reserve the right to set forth further arguments supporting the patentability of their claims, including the separate patentability of the dependent claims not explicitly addressed herein, in future papers.

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are allowable, and the present application is in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, favorable reexamination and reconsideration of the application in light of the remarks is courteously solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone Brian K. Dutton, Reg. No. 47,255, at 202-955-8753.

Dated: June 18, 2009

Respectfully submitted

Ronald P. Kananen

Registration No.: 24,104

Christopher M. Tobin

Registration No.: 40,290

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC Correspondence Customer Number: 23353

Attorneys for Applicant